

Application No. 10/089,558
Amendment dated March 17, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 17, 2004

REMARKS

The Examiner's requirement that Figs. 2, 4 and 5 should be designated as "prior art" is noted. Drawing corrections are submitted herewith embodying the requested legends.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In this regard, applicant has deleted claims 3 and 5.


Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura et al (5,644,968). The design shown in '968 utilizes an economical approach since both the tilting and axial movement of the disc (11) is accomplished by the through hole (20). This use of through hole (20) causes the pivotal axis of the disc (11) to change during a tilting movement of the disc. This is due to the fact that the point of contact between the disc (11) and the drive shaft (6) moves during the tilting of the disc. Thus, there is no constantly defined pivot axis for the disc.

Claim 1 has been amended to specifically call for independent axial and tilting movement of the disc so that a constant pivotal axis is defined for the disc. This independent axial and pivotal movement provides a clear distinction over the cited prior art.

New claims 7 and 8 have been added to the application. These claims are independent claims that include all of the limitations of claims 1 and 4 and claims 1 and 6.

It is earnestly believed that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been met and discussed and that this case is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary A. Essmann
(Reg. No. 29,376)

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
(414) 271-7590
Atty. Docket No. 825-00164